



[Return to article page](#)

To print: Select File and then Print from your browser's menu.

This story was printed from FindArticles.com, located at <http://www.findarticles.com>.

EContent May, 2001

Joining the In-Crowd.

Author/s: Greg R. Notess

Inktomi's Pay-for-Placement Program

One of Inktomi's latest movements has been in the direction of pay-for-inclusion indexing of Web sites.

as one of the original Web-based Application Service Providers (ASPs)--before that term was even popular--Inktomi has been the underlying database and search interface at many portals and other sites offering a Web-wide search engine.

Inktomi has diversified into several other Net-related businesses beyond search, but its search product line continues to develop. The Inktomi Search Everywhere initiative covers a wide variety of search products for portals, the enterprise, and content providers.

One of its latest movements has been in the direction of pay-for-inclusion indexing of Web sites. Web site owners and designers have long complained about the difficulty and lag time for getting into search engine databases. Inktomi now offers Web sites guaranteed inclusion and more frequent indexing for a fee. According to Inktomi chief strategist Andrew Littlefield, the company's intent is to "give publishers more control over which content is in the index and how frequently the content is updated, while maintaining the diversity and unbiased nature of the Inktomi search index."

THE SUBMISSION CONUNDRUM

For years, the basic principle behind Internet search engines was that they could send their spiders crawling from one page to another along the hyperlink trail to index all publicly accessible Web pages. In addition, a free submit option would give new, and as yet unlinked, sites the chance to get spidered as well.



[Return to article page](#)

To print: Select File and then Print from your browser's menu.

This story was printed from FindArticles.com, located at <http://www.findarticles.com>.

Internet World May 1, 2001

Pay Per Viewer.(Industry Trend or Event)

Author/s: Anastasia Ashman

HUGE ACQUISITION COSTS ARE NO LONGER VIABLE AS NEW MODELS EMERGE

DURING THE RACE TO build dot-com brands, leaps of logic in customer acquisition strategy were epidemic. The company with the most customers wins, ran one such leap of faith. Or that once consumers are aware of a company, they'll choose to do business with it. Or, worse still, that a first-time customer can be expected to return again and again. A company like the troubled Priceline.com--whose celebrity television commercials were widely known and almost equally disliked, can boast it has sold six million airline tickets, and even so, can't be sure where the next dollar is coming from--handily disproves all three pieces of conventional "wisdom."

That's why the practice of spending a hundred bucks--or several hundred--to acquire an online customer didn't pan out. Instead, many Internet-based businesses discovered that splashy ad campaigns drew curious consumers whose meager, experimental purchases failed to cover the expense laid out to entice them to the site. Even worse, organizations with business models offering a nonbranded experience meant to appeal to fickle discount shoppers--a phenomenon for which Priceline is the poster child--encountered the sheer impossibility of acquiring a brand-disloyal customer in the first place.

But as companies search for smarter ways to operate, acquiring high-quality customers more efficiently has become a compelling theme, says Julie Breen, an analyst at the Boston Consulting Group (BCG). Tactics to improve return on investment include a variety of customer relationship management tools, more creative marketing arrangements, and revised business models. BCG, which found customer acquisition costs averaged \$82 in 1999, recommends e-commerce companies spend no more than \$20 to \$30 in 2001. However, best-practice experts insist that it is impossible to nail



[Return to article page](#)

To print: Select File and then Print from your browser's menu.

This story was printed from FindArticles.com, located at <http://www.findarticles.com>.

PR Newswire Nov 22, 1999

Colorstamps Search Engine Launches With Explosive Web Traffic Growth.

First-of-its-kind Search Engine Pays Cash to Internet Users and Drives

Targeted Traffic to Advertisers' Web Sites

MOUNTAIN VIEW, Calif., Nov. 22 /PRNewswire/ -- Colorstamps Inc. today announced the launch of a first-of-its-kind Internet search engine which rewards users with cash for searching the Web. Unlike other Internet rewards programs that require users to perform certain tasks or make purchases, Colorstamps pays users cash for searching the Web content and clicking on relevant advertisers' Web links. Users receive accumulated cash rewards by check once every month. The new service is powered, financed and supported by Hewlett-Packard Company to ensure uptime and scalability.

"Colorstamps provides Web surfers with an easy-to-use search utility and at the same time rewards them with cash," said Victor Shi, founder and chief executive officer of Colorstamps Inc. "Colorstamps has now made the saying 'time is money' a reality for Web surfers. Our users get rewarded for spending time doing what they would normally do."

Cash Rewards for Users

For users, the Colorstamps Web site acts much like a regular search engine. Visitors to the site, which is not clogged with banner advertisements, can search the Web using key words that direct them to relevant URLs or Web links. The difference is that users receive cash for clicking-through to the Web sites identified by the keyword search. An on-screen display shows users the amount of cash they can receive by visiting a participating advertiser's Web site. An average Web surfer can receive \$20 to \$50 per month.



[Return to article page](#)

To print: Select File and then Print from your browser's menu.

This story was printed from FindArticles.com, located at <http://www.findarticles.com>.

PR Newswire August 31, 1998

AdKnowledge Introduces Campaign Manager - Automates Web Ad Process and Increases Advertising Effectiveness

Newest Component of the AdKnowledge System Saves Advertising Agencies Time,

**Money and Hassle in Buying
and Trafficking Web Ads**

PALO ALTO, Calif., Aug. 31 /PRNewswire/ -- AdKnowledge, the only independent provider of end-to-end web advertising management products for advertising agencies and their clients, today announced the availability of Campaign Manager. The latest component of the AdKnowledge System, Campaign Manager improves agencies' profitability by streamlining the execution of buys and the trafficking of web advertising campaigns. With the new Campaign Manager, the AdKnowledge System builds on the company's web media planning and ad serving technologies for a single system that makes the web advertising process more manageable and gives advertising agencies better control of their web media dollars.

Integrated System Saves Agencies Time and Money

The AdKnowledge System -- which includes four components that span planning, campaign management, ad placement and tracking, and reporting and analysis -- increases the effectiveness of campaigns, thereby improving the return on investment of ad spending. The System's components are seamlessly integrated to enable agencies to better focus on their core business, and include:

* Planner, AdKnowledge's comprehensive pre-buy and planning module designed to help agencies make informed media decisions and negotiate smarter. In addition to syndicated research from MRI and Simmons, Planner integrates an extensive amount of research data supplied by third-party partners including Media Metrix, SRI and NetGuide. And now with this release, NetRatings' target



[Return to article page](#)

To print: Select File and then Print from your browser's menu.

This story was printed from FindArticles.com, located at <http://www.findarticles.com>.

Business WireMarch 31, 2000

Web-Ignite and Mamma.com Team Up for Premium Search-Result Placement; New Online Service Optimizes Search Results.

Business Editors & Multimedia Writers

BUELLTON, Calif.--(BUSINESS WIRE)--March 31, 2000

Search-engine specialists Web-Ignite Corp. and Mamma.com are pooling their resources to help U.S. companies do a better job of attracting Web-site visitors.

Their new, one-of-a-kind service offers above-the-fold **search-result placement, 12-month locking rates, weighted cost-per-click average**, and listing with reputable search-engine traffic agencies such as Yahoo!, Excite!, AltaVista and Lycos.

The end results for participating Web sites are highly qualified business customers, exact and competent Web-site traffic, specific targeting with quality placement, and top-of-mind recall as a top queried search result.

How It Works

Qualifying companies can choose one of three options: 1) Give Mamma.com direct access to query their database; 2) **Provide Mamma.com with a list of keywords** to trigger a query; or 3) Complete an Excel spreadsheet provided by Mamma.com that includes all relevant keywords, search titles, **a site description** and a unique linking URL to a specific page on the client's site. All options are based on **cost per click**.

Mamma.com's Patrick Hopf, content optimization manager, requires client sites to have depth. "We're looking for unique URL page links for each particular keyword," explained Hopf. "For example, a search result for 'Sony DVD' should link to a page specifically containing information about Sony DVDs. A home-page result with many links



[Return to article page](#)

To print: Select File and then Print from your browser's menu.

This story was printed from FindArticles.com, located at <http://www.findarticles.com>.

Brandweek May 3, 1999

Name Game.

Author/s: Catharine P. Taylor

What's in a name? Thanks to Estee Lauder's day in court, the answer's on its way.

In late January, Estee Lauder took one of those steps bound to call into question the boundaries of advertising in interactive media.

The New York-based cosmetics company sued Excite for trademark infringement because Excite had sold the banner above the keyword search for "Estee Lauder" to Fragrance Counter, a company selling a variety of fragrances--including Estee Lauder's. Those familiar with this increasingly common and uniquely digital form of ambush marketing, may well note that the advertiser in question could have been much more threatening than a retailer who sells the company's products.

The practice of "buying" another company's search term dates back to 1995, when Ogilvy & Mather bought every Windows 95-related term its media department could think of on behalf of IBM, in a last-ditch effort to promote Big Blue's OS/2 Warp operating system. (The shop won an award from this magazine group's Mediaweek magazine for the ploy.)

But what, exactly, is being bought? Estee Lauder contends that Fragrance Counter was allowed to buy the Estee Lauder name. But one can make an argument that the way these media buys are referred to in the vernacular is grossly misleading. Yes, what Fragrance Counter did is referred to in the industry as "buying a search term." But it seems clear that what Fragrance Counter actually bought is merely an adjacency to the Estee Lauder brand name. Type in "Estee Lauder" into the Excite search engine, and what you get back is, true, a Fragrance Counter Banner. However, you also get an Amazon.com button pre-set to search for books about Estee Lauder, and no less than 13 other links to more information about Estee Lauder and its products. The amount of



[Return to article page](#)

To print: Select File and then Print from your browser's menu.

This story was printed from FindArticles.com, located at <http://www.findarticles.com>.

OnlineMay, 1999

Rising Relevance in Search Engines.

Author/s: Greg R. Notess

Back in the medieval days of the Internet, when a search used engine was still the software used to access bibliographic or other databases with no connection to the Internet, there was some fascinating research on statistical algorithms for sorting the output of a full-text search by projected relevance. In the bibliographic realm, search output is typically sorted in reverse chronological order. Other available sort options might include an alphabetical arrangement by a specific field, such as author, title, or publication.

Efforts at sorting by relevance developed more sophistication even as the Internet moved from its computer science and defense industry roots into the popular consciousness. In some cases, output ranked by relevance score proved to be quite effective in research settings. Thus, in the early days of development of the Web search engines, the preferred output, if not the only seemingly sensible output, relied on relevance scores. The standard sorts used by bibliographic databases were not helpful with the mass of Web pages. Why sort by date when all the Web pages had been written in the past year? The HTML title element was (and often continues to be) too inconsistently used to make an alphabetical title sort very meaningful. Most Web pages had and continue to have no fielded author designation for use in sorting.

On the other hand, sorting by 1%RLs or domain name was certainly a possibility. Yet once again, in the early days of Web development, the unofficial standard of www.name.com was just beginning. Most Web pages were on sites with less meaningful names, such as xxx.lanl.gov or l2vbiol.stateu.edu or physik.technik.ch or just an IP number.

Therefore, in the early days of the Web search engines, only one option made sense, and that was relevance ranking. Throw a search word or two at these mammoth indexes containing words published on Web pages, and the list of hits would all be sorted by their



[Return to article page](#)

To print: Select File and then Print from your browser's menu.

This story was printed from FindArticles.com, located at <http://www.findarticles.com>.

OnlineMay, 1999

Results ranking in Web Search Engines.

Author/s: Martin P. Courtois

World Wide Web search engines have become the most heavily-used on line services, with millions of searches performed each day. Their popularity is due, in part, to their ease of use, which stems primarily from their use of relevancy searching (also called statistical or fuzzy searching).

Many search engines support Boolean operators, field searching, and other advanced techniques, but with relevancy searching users simply enter their terms and click the Search button. While searches may retrieve thousands of hits, search engine producers claim their systems place items that best match the search query at the top of the results list. In this study, we test how five major search engines retrieve and rank documents in answer to sample search queries.

RELEVANCY AND RANKING

The basic premise of relevancy searching is that results are sorted, or ranked, according to certain criteria. Criteria can include the number of terms matched, proximity of terms, location of terms within the document, frequency of terms (both within the document and within the entire database, document length, and other factors. The exact "formula" for how these criteria are applied is the "ranking algorithm" and varies among search engines.

In the highly-competitive search engine industry, ranking algorithms are closely-guarded company secrets. Most search engine producers, however, give a general description of criteria they consider in computing a page's ranking "score" and its placement in the results list. HotBot, for example, describes term frequency and location as primary factors [1]. Documents with more occurrences of the search term receive a higher weight, but the overall obscurity of the term within the database also has an impact. In addition, the number of occurrences relative to the document length is considered, and shorter documents are ranked higher than a longer document with



[Return to article page](#)

To print: Select File and then Print from your browser's menu.

This story was printed from FindArticles.com, located at <http://www.findarticles.com>.

PR Newswire Jan 18, 2000

TeknoSurf.com Changes Name to Advertising.com.

Fast-Growing New Media Direct Marketing Company

Secures Ad Industry's Hottest URL

BALTIMORE, Jan. 18 /PRNewswire/ -- TeknoSurf.com, Inc., a fast-growing new media direct marketing company, today announced the renaming of their company as Advertising.com, Inc. The company specializes in new media direct marketing and channel building through the use of proprietary, intelligent targeting technology. Advertising.com also announced today the appointment of former vice president of business development for DoubleClick Inc., Jeffrey A. Dickey, as Chief Strategy Officer.

"With the name Advertising.com, our company is launching a new era of marketing based on industry-leading technology and services that deliver unsurpassed results for our clients," said Scott Ferber, Co-Founder and CEO of Advertising.com. "The success of our optimization technology and the popularity of our product offerings has helped us to achieve dramatic revenue growth and to deliver impressive client numbers."

Advertising.com currently offers a complete package of advertising solutions for targeting consumers that features an integrated range of Web, e-messaging and desktop product solutions.

Advertising.com's products are built around its proprietary

AdLearn(SM) technology, a technology that delivers average click-through-rates of 1.12%, almost three times the industry average of 0.4%. The company's revenues have grown over 230% over the past three months and monthly revenues are over \$3 million.

"Advertising.com links the **traditional Cost Per Click (CPC) model** with the industry's best technology to deliver results that far exceed industry standards," said John Ferber, Co-Founder and Chief Internet Officer, Advertising.com. "We are poised at the leading edge of Internet marketing with technology that we believe will



[Return to article page](#)

To print: Select File and then Print from your browser's menu.

This story was printed from FindArticles.com, located at <http://www.findarticles.com>.

Brandweek March 15, 1999

Content's Comeback.

Author/s: Susan Kuchinskas

As the portal category shakes out, content is once again on the rise.

A year ago at this time, Internet types were abuzz with the one-size-fits all portal concept. If much of the industry had its way, the one-stop shopping trend would have transformed every site into the looking glass-filled with news, horoscopes and stock charts-by which its users peered into the Web.

One year later, a sort of post-portal depression has set in. While players such as Yahoo!, America Online and Excite seem to be realizing their portal dreams, most Web publishers have discovered that only a handful of sites can be the next Yahoo!.

In the search for a new business model, it looks as though the Internet will come full circle, to the medium's beginnings as a place to publish content about the niche of one's desire. If these more focused sites bear any relationship to portals, it's as vertical portals, sites that specialize in focused topics of interest to particular segments of the Web audience. "What people have realized," says Jeff Mallett, president and chief operating officer at Yahoo!, Santa Clara, Calif., "is that the core aggregation play is only going to be three or four front ends." It's a return to content that validates, to some extent, the dramatic arc of the history of magazines, which became more targeted as other mass media took on the role of being all things to all people. Right now television is going through similar fragmentation pains as it splits into dozens, if not hundreds of niche channels.

"The old mass general magazines like Life and Look gave way to vertical magazines," points out Robin Wolaner, executive vice president of CNet, San Francisco. Her opinion is informed by two decades in the print world, founding the magazines Parenting and Grandparenting, launching Martha Stewart Living and Vibe, and publishing California regional magazine Sunset. "In the same way,"



[Return to article page](#)

To print: Select File and then Print from your browser's menu.

This story was printed from FindArticles.com, located at <http://www.findarticles.com>.

OnlineMay, 1999

Rising Relevance in Search Engines.

Author/s: Greg R. Notess

Back in the medieval days of the Internet, when a search used engine was still the software used to access bibliographic or other databases with no connection to the Internet, there was some fascinating research on statistical algorithms for sorting the output of a full-text search by projected relevance. In the bibliographic realm, search output is typically sorted in reverse chronological order. Other available sort options might include an alphabetical arrangement by a specific field, such as author, title, or publication.

Efforts at sorting by relevance developed more sophistication even as the Internet moved from its computer science and defense industry roots into the popular consciousness. In some cases, output ranked by relevance score proved to be quite effective in research settings. Thus, in the early days of development of the Web search engines, the preferred output, if not the only seemingly sensible output, relied on relevance scores. The standard sorts used by bibliographic databases were not helpful with the mass of Web pages. Why sort by date when all the Web pages had been written in the past year? The HTML title element was (and often continues to be) too inconsistently used to make an alphabetical title sort very meaningful. Most Web pages had and continue to have no fielded author designation for use in sorting.

On the other hand, sorting by 1%RLs or domain name was certainly a possibility. Yet once again, in the early days of Web development, the unofficial standard of www.name.com was just beginning. Most Web pages were on sites with less meaningful names, such as xxx.lanl.gov or l2vbiol.stateu.edu or physik.technik.ch or just an IP number.

Therefore, in the early days of the Web search engines, only one option made sense, and that was relevance ranking. Throw a search word or two at these mammoth indexes containing words published on Web pages, and the list of hits would all be sorted by their



[Return to article page](#)

To print: Select File and then Print from your browser's menu.

This story was printed from FindArticles.com, located at <http://www.findarticles.com>.

OnlineMay, 1999

Results ranking in Web Search Engines.

Author/s: Martin P. Courtois

World Wide Web search engines have become the most heavily-used on line services, with millions of searches performed each day. Their popularity is due, in part, to their ease of use, which stems primarily from their use of relevancy searching (also called statistical or fuzzy searching).

Many search engines support Boolean operators, field searching, and other advanced techniques, but with relevancy searching users simply enter their terms and click the Search button. While searches may retrieve thousands of hits, search engine producers claim their systems place items that best match the search query at the top of the results list. In this study, we test how five major search engines retrieve and rank documents in answer to sample search queries.

RELEVANCY AND RANKING

The basic premise of relevancy searching is that results are sorted, or ranked, according to certain criteria. Criteria can include the number of terms matched, proximity of terms, location of terms within the document, frequency of terms (both within the document and within the entire database, document length, and other factors. The exact "formula" for how these criteria are applied is the "ranking algorithm" and varies among search engines.

In the highly-competitive search engine industry, ranking algorithms are closely-guarded company secrets. Most search engine producers, however, give a general description of criteria they consider in computing a page's ranking "score" and its placement in the results list. HotBot, for example, describes term frequency and location as primary factors [1]. Documents with more occurrences of the search term receive a higher weight, but the overall obscurity of the term within the database also has an impact. In addition, the number of occurrences relative to the document length is considered, and shorter documents are ranked higher than a longer document with



[Return to article page](#)

To print: Select File and then Print from your browser's menu.

This story was printed from FindArticles.com, located at <http://www.findarticles.com>.

BrandweekMarch 15, 1999

Content's Comeback.

Author/s: Susan Kuchinskas

As the portal category shakes out, content is once again on the rise.

A year ago at this time, Internet types were abuzz with the one-size-fits all portal concept. If much of the industry had its way, the one-stop shopping trend would have transformed every site into the looking glass-filled with news, horoscopes and stock charts-by which its users peered into the Web.

One year later, a sort of post-portal depression has set in. While players such as Yahoo!, America Online and Excite seem to be realizing their portal dreams, most Web publishers have discovered that only a handful of sites can be the next Yahoo!.

In the search for a new business model, it looks as though the Internet will come full circle, to the medium's beginnings as a place to publish content about the niche of one's desire. If these more focused sites bear any relationship to portals, it's as vertical portals, sites that specialize in focused topics of interest to particular segments of the Web audience. "What people have realized," says Jeff Mallett, president and chief operating officer at Yahoo!, Santa Clara, Calif., "is that the core aggregation play is only going to be three or four front ends." It's a return to content that validates, to some extent, the dramatic arc of the history of magazines, which became more targeted as other mass media took on the role of being all things to all people. Right now television is going through similar fragmentation pains as it splits into dozens, if not hundreds of niche channels.

"The old mass general magazines like Life and Look gave way to vertical magazines," points out Robin Wolaner, executive vice president of CNet, San Francisco. Her opinion is informed by two decades in the print world, founding the magazines Parenting and Grandparenting, launching Martha Stewart Living and Vibe, and publishing California regional magazine Sunset. "In the same way,"

09/072,220

[Return to article page](#)

To print: Select File and then Print from your browser's menu.

This story was printed from FindArticles.com, located at <http://www.findarticles.com>.

OnlineMay, 1999

Results ranking in Web Search Engines.

Author/s: Martin P. Courtois

World Wide Web search engines have become the most heavily-used on line services, with millions of searches performed each day. Their popularity is due, in part, to their ease of use, which stems primarily from their use of relevancy searching (also called statistical or fuzzy searching).

Many search engines support Boolean operators, field searching, and other advanced techniques, but with relevancy searching users simply enter their terms and click the Search button: While searches may retrieve thousands of hits, search engine producers claim their systems place items that best match the search query at the top of the results list. In this study, we test how five major search engines retrieve and rank documents in answer to sample search queries.

RELEVANCY AND RANKING

The basic premise of relevancy searching is that results are sorted, or ranked, according to certain criteria. Criteria can include the number of terms matched, proximity of terms, location of terms within the document, frequency of terms (both within the document and within the entire database, document length, and other factors. The exact "formula" for how these criteria are applied is the "ranking algorithm" and varies among search engines.

In the highly-competitive search engine industry, ranking algorithms are closely-guarded company secrets. Most search engine producers, however, give a general description of criteria they consider in computing a page's ranking "score" and its placement in the results list. HotBot, for example, describes term frequency and location as primary factors [1]. Documents with more occurrences of the search term receive a higher weight, but the overall obscurity of the term within the database also has an impact. In addition, the number of occurrences relative to the document length is considered, and shorter documents are ranked higher than a longer document with the same number of occurrences. Terms in the title or metatags are

09/072,220

[Return to article page](#)

To print: Select File and then Print from your browser's menu.

This story was printed from FindArticles.com, located at <http://www.findarticles.com>.

BrandweekMay 3, 1999

Name Game.

Author/s: Catharine P. Taylor

What's in a name? Thanks to Estee Lauder's day in court, the answer's on its way.

In late January, Estee Lauder took one of those steps bound to call into question the boundaries of advertising in interactive media.

The New York-based cosmetics company sued Excite for trademark infringement because Excite had sold the banner above the keyword search for "Estee Lauder" to Fragrance Counter, a company selling a variety of fragrances--including Estee Lauder's. Those familiar with this increasingly common and uniquely digital form of ambush marketing, may well note that the advertiser in question could have been much more threatening than a retailer who sells the company's products.

The practice of "buying" another company's search term dates back to 1995, when Ogilvy & Mather bought every Windows 95-related term its media department could think of on behalf of IBM, in a last-ditch effort to promote Big Blue's OS/2 Warp operating system. (The shop won an award from this magazine group's Mediaweek magazine for the ploy.)

But what, exactly, is being bought? Estee Lauder contends that Fragrance Counter was allowed to buy the Estee Lauder name. But one can make an argument that the way these media buys are referred to in the vernacular is grossly misleading. Yes, what Fragrance Counter did is referred to in the industry as "buying a search term." But it seems clear that what Fragrance Counter actually bought is merely an adjacency to the Estee Lauder brand name. Type in "Estee Lauder" into the Excite search engine, and what you get back is, true, a Fragrance Counter Banner. However, you also get an Amazon.com button pre-set to search for books about Estee Lauder, and no less than 13 other links to more information about Estee Lauder and its products. The amount of pixels and premium placement that Fragrance Counter receives for

09/072,220

[Return to article page](#)

To print: Select File and then Print from your browser's menu.

This story was printed from FindArticles.com, located at <http://www.findarticles.com>.

OnlineMay, 1999

Rising Relevance in Search Engines.

Author/s: Greg R. Notess

Back in the medieval days of the Internet, when a search used engine was still the software used to access bibliographic or other databases with no connection to the Internet, there was some fascinating research on statistical algorithms for sorting the output of a full-text search by projected relevance. In the bibliographic realm, search output is typically sorted in reverse chronological order. Other available sort options might include an alphabetical arrangement by a specific field, such as author, title, or publication.

Efforts at sorting by relevance developed more sophistication even as the Internet moved from its computer science and defense industry roots into the popular consciousness. In some cases, output ranked by relevance score proved to be quite effective in research settings. Thus, in the early days of development of the Web search engines, the preferred output, if not the only seemingly sensible output, relied on relevance scores. The standard sorts used by bibliographic databases were not helpful with the mass of Web pages. Why sort by date when all the Web pages had been written in the past year? The HTML title element was (and often continues to be) too inconsistently used to make an alphabetical title sort very meaningful. Most Web pages had and continue to have no fielded author designation for use in sorting.

On the other hand, sorting by 1%RLs or domain name was certainly a possibility. Yet once again, in the early days of Web development, the unofficial standard of www.name.com was just beginning. Most Web pages were on sites with less meaningful names, such as xxx.lanl.gov or l2vbiol.stateu.edu or physik.technik.ch or just an IP number.

Therefore, in the early days of the Web search engines, only one option made sense, and that was relevance ranking. Throw a search word or two at these mammoth indexes containing words published on Web pages, and the list of hits would all be sorted by their relevance "score." The scores intended to represent how relevant

Inventors: **Murray; Peter N** (New Canaan, CT)
Assignee: **Digital Marketing Communications, Inc.** (Morristown, NJ)
Appl. No.: **868122**
Filed: **June 3, 1997**
Current U.S. Class: **705/14; 345/666; 345/767; 345/808**

Results of Search in db for:

SPEC/"advertising OR advertise OR advertize OR advertizing" AND ACLM/"(adjust OR change OR changing OR adjusted OR changed OR adjusting) AND bid amount": 0 patents.

No patents have matched your query
Searching ...

Results of Search in db for:

(SPEC/"advertising OR advertise OR advertize OR advertizing" AND ACLM/" (((adjust OR change) OR changing) OR adjusted) OR changed) OR adjusting) AND bid": 0 patents.
Searching ...

Results of Search in db for:

SPEC/"advertising OR advertise OR advertize OR advertizing" AND ACLM/"(adjust OR change OR changing OR adjusted OR changed OR adjusting) AND (bid OR bidden OR bidding)": 0 patents.

Results of Search in db for:

SPEC/"advertising OR advertise OR advertize OR advertizing" AND SPEC/"(adjust OR change OR changing OR adjusted OR changed OR adjusting) AND (bid OR bidden OR bidding)": 0 patents.

Results of Search in db for:

ABST/"advertise OR advertising OR advertizing" AND ABST/"bid or bidding or bidden": 0 patents.

No patents have matched your query

Inventors: **Gabbard; Chuck E.** (Southport, NC); **Chaffins; Bruce R.** (Knoxville, TN); **Howerton, III; Everett B.** (Roswell, GA)

Assignee: **Creative Internet Concepts, LLC** (South Port, NC)

Appl. No.: **193459**

Filed: **November 16, 1998**

Current U.S. Class:

United States Patent

Murray

705/14; 705/1; 715/513

6,061,659

May 9, 2000

Inventors: **Gabbard; Chuck E.** (Southport, NC); **Chaffins; Bruce R.** (Knoxville, TN); **Howerton, III; Everett B.** (Roswell, GA)

Assignee: **Creative Internet Concepts, LLC** (South Port, NC)

Appl. No.: **193459**

Filed: **November 16, 1998**

Current U.S. Class:

705/14; 705/1; 715/513

United States Patent

6,061,659

Murray

May 9, 2000

System and method for integrating a message into a graphical environment

Inventors: **Auxier; Robert** (Silver Spring, MD); **Khera; Vivek** (Rockville, MD); **Seidman; Charles** (Merion, PA)
Assignee: **RealTime Media** (Haverford, PA)

Appl. No.: **263526**

Filed: **March 5, 1999**

Current U.S. Class:

United States Patent

Murray

463/42; 273/269; 463/17

6,243,104

June 5, 2001

1/9/6 (Item 1 from file: 629)
DIALOG(R) File 629:EIU:BUS. Newsletters
(c) 2003 Economist Intelligence Unit. All rts. reserv.

02177045

US Technical profile: The nuts and bolts

COUNTRY: United States

JOURNAL: Finance & Treasury - June 27, 1994

WORD COUNT: 887

TEXT:

If you would like to learn more about IBOS, join us for a look under the hood

For those who do not live in the information-systems department, locked in close quarters with file servers and VAXs, the means by which IBOS can provide real-time information flows while still maintaining an acceptable level of security and foolproofing may be something of a mystery. The system is also young, just bringing its first users on line, and according to one experienced banking-systems consultant, "there are bound to be some bugs in there." Nevertheless, the IBOS platform is, at least to a limited extent, up and running, and the following is a brief look at the bits, bytes and processes that make it tick.

(1) Hardware. IBOS uses British Telecom's Tymnet and Infonet networks and runs as a packet-switched X.25 network.

(2) Speed. The network is unusually fast. Most communication systems operate like airlines with connecting flights: If you want to get to Los Angeles from New York, you have to go through Chicago. In the same way, the network that operates in your office very likely routes information through a central hub or "server". When there is too much traffic flowing through the server, the rate at which information flows through the network slows down.

IBOS, however, does not work on this standard configuration. It is a "multipoint-to-multipoint" network, which means that messages flow directly between banks and branches on an account-to-account basis. They do not have to linger in a queue at a "hub" before they can be processed, which dramatically expedites the procedure and also increases the security of the transaction.

(3) Transmission format. The system's messaging capabilities are compatible with most existing systems; IBOS has a standardised common architecture, with a real-time, three-message protocol. All messages conform to the financial-payments standards specified by SWIFT and EDIFACT.

(4) Bank interface. Each bank connects its host computer, where its propriety database of customer accounts is held, to an Automated Interface Unit (AIU), which provides a common interface into the IBOS network for all the banks involved (see diagram, p 5). The AIU is a low-cost, standard minicomputer (Digital Micro VAX) with special software developed to facilitate the following:

- y Computer communications protocol conversion operations;
- y Systems and message-delivery control;
- y Message routing;
- y Security (encryption and authentication);
- y Reconciliation and netting;